arXiv:1212.5960v1 [math.CO] 24 Dec 2012

A Canonical Characterization of the Family of Barriers in General Graphs

Nanao Kita

Keio University, Yokohama, Japan
`kita@a2.keio.jp`

Abstract. This paper is concerned with matching theory. The notion of barriers plays important roles in numerous contexts of matching theory. Lovász revealed a powerful structure called the canonical partition that the family of maximal barriers forms in an elementary graph. However, corresponding results for general graphs have not been known. In this paper, with our previous work which shows canonical structures of general graphs with perfect matchings, we give a canonical characterization of the maximal barriers in general graphs.

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with matchings on graphs. For general accounts on matching theory, we refer to the book by Lovász and Plummer [1].

Matching theory is of central importance in graph theory and combinatorial optimization [2], with numerous practical applications [3]. A *matching* of a graph G is a set of edges $F \subseteq E(G)$ no two of which have common vertices. A matching of cardinality $|V(G)|/2$ (resp. $|V(G)|/2-1$) is called a *perfect matching* (resp. a *near-perfect matching*). We call a graph *factorizable* if it has at least one perfect matching. An edge $e \in E(G)$ is called *allowed* if there is a maximum matching of G containing e. (Actually, it is usually a notion for factorizable graph, though we generalize it for general graphs.) For a factorizable graph G, each connected component of the subgraph of G determined by all the allowed edges of it is called an *elementary component* of G, and, in this paper, we denote them as $\mathcal{G}(G)$. A graph which has exactly one elementary component is called *elementary.* For each elementary component H, we call $G[V(H)]$ an *induced elementary component* of G, and denote the induced elementary components of G as $\mathcal{G}(G)$.

In matching theory, the notion of barriers plays significant roles. Given a graph, we call a connected component of it with an odd (resp. even) number of vertices *odd component* (resp. even component). Given $X \subseteq V(G)$ of a graph G, we denote as $q_G(X)$ the number of odd components the graph resulting from deleting X from G has, and the cardinality of a maximum matching of G as $\nu(G)$. There is a min-max theorem called the *Berge formula* [1] that for any graph G, $|V(G)| - 2\nu(G) = \max\{q_G(X) - |X| : X \subseteq V(G)\}$. A set of vertices that attains the maximum in the right side of the equation is called a *barrier.*

Therefore, roughly speaking, the barriers correspond to the dual solutions of the maximum matching problem, and characterize the maximum matchings. In fact, in the context of linear programming, the dual problem of the maximum cardinality matching problem is the one called the *minimum capacity odd-set cover problem* [4], and each minimizer of it is associated with a barrier.

The notion of (inclusion-wise) maximal barriers are of great important. It is known as the *canonical partition* [1, 5–7] that the family of maximal barrier of an elementary graph forms a partition of it vertex set. The canonical partition tells a lot about structures of elementary graphs (see [1]), and derives powerful properties such as the *two ear theorem* [1], and the *brick decomposition* or the *tight cut decomposition* are obtained by it, thus plays a key role in the polyhedral aspects of matching theory i.e. the study of the *matching polytope* and the *matching lattice* [8–10].

However, it is also known that the family of maximal barriers of a non-elementary graph (whether it is factorizable or not) never gives the partition of its vertices [1]. Moreover, there have been no known facts on how all the maximal barriers are canonically distributed in a general graphs.

In our previous paper [11, 12], we have revealed canonical structures of general factorizable graphs, which we call the *generalized cathedral structure* in this paper. Two notions are central there; one is a generalization of the canonical partition, and the other is a partially ordered structure among induced elementary components.

In this paper, with our previous work, we characterize how all the maximal barriers are distributed in general graphs. (Actually, we work on the *odd-maximal barriers*, which is a wider notion including the maximal barriers, and seems to be more reasonable.) Here, the *Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition* appears as a crucial tool to investigate the structure.

Since the notion of barriers is quite important, we are sure that our results will be productive facts in matching theory, thus contribute to the foundation of combinatorial optimization as well.

In fact, another proof of the cathedral theorem is easily derived from the results of this paper [13]. There are more consequences; In our subsequent paper [14], we give a generalization of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition, which is originally for bipartite graphs, for general graphs, from the point of view of barriers. Moreover, it derives yet another characterization of the *optimal ear-decomposition* [15].

In Section 2, we introduce notations, definitions, and some preliminary facts on matchings used in this paper. Section 3 is to introduce our previous works [11, 12], the generalized cathedral structure. In Section 4, we introduce the results of this paper, which is on a canonical characterization of odd-maximal barriers. In Section 5, we show another polynomial-time algorithm to compute the cathedral structure, with the results in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we list some standard definitions and well-known properties. Basics on sets, graphs, digraphs, and algorithms mostly conform to [2].

When discussing the cost of computation, we denote as n and m respectively the number of vertices and edges of a given graph, if it is apparent from the contexts.

We define the *symmetric difference* of two set A, B, which have a common super set, as $A \triangle B := (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$.

Let G be a graph and $X \subseteq V(G)$. The subgraph of G induced by X is denoted by $G[X]$. $G - X$ means $G[V(G) \setminus X]$. We define the *contraction* of G by X as $G/X := G/E(G[X])$.

We say $H \subseteq G$ if H is a subgraph of G. If it is clear from the context, we sometimes regard a subgraph $H \subseteq G$ as the vertex set $V(H)$, a vertex v as a graph $(\{v\}, \emptyset)$.

The set of edges that has one end vertex in $X \subseteq V(G)$ and the other vertex in $Y \subseteq V(G)$ is denoted as $E_G[X, Y]$. We denote $E_G[X, V(G) \setminus X]$ as $\delta_G(X)$. We define the *set of neighbors* of X as the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus X$ that are adjacent to vertices in X, and denote as $N_G(X)$. We sometimes denote $E_G[X, Y]$, $\delta_G(X)$, $N_G(X)$ as just $E[X, Y]$, $\delta(X)$, $N(X)$ if they are apparent from the context.

For two graphs G_1 and G_2, $G_1 \cup G_2 := (V(G_1) \cup V(G_2), E(G_1) \cup E(G_2))$ is called the *union* of them, and $G_1 \cap G_2 := (V(G_1) \cap V(G_2), E(G_1) \cap E(G_2))$ the *intersection* of them. We sometimes denote $G_1 \cup G_1$ as $G_1 + G_2$.

Let $\hat{G}$ be a graph such that $G \subseteq \hat{G}$. For $e = uv \in E(\hat{G})$, $G + e$ means $(V(G) \cup \{u, v\}, E(G) \cup \{e\})$, and $G - e$ means $(V(G), E(G) \setminus \{e\})$. For a set of edges $F = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^{k}$, $G + F$ and $G - F$ means respectively $G + e_1 + \cdots + e_k$ and $G - e_1 - \cdots - e_k$.

We treat paths and circuits as graphs. For a path P and $x, y \in V(P)$, xPy means the subpath on P between x and y.

We say a matching M of G *exposes* $v \in V(G)$ if $\delta(v) \cap M = \emptyset$, otherwise say it *covers* v. For a matching M of G and $u \in V(G)$ covered by M, u' denote the vertex to which u is matched by M. For $X \subseteq V(G)$, M_X denotes $M \cap E(G[X])$.

Let M be a matching of G. For $Q \subseteq G$, which is a path or circuit, we call Q *M-alternating* if $E(Q) \setminus M$ is a matching of Q. Let $P \subseteq G$ be an M-alternating path with end vertices u and v. If P has even number of edges and starts with an edge in M if it is traced from u, we call it an *M-balanced path* from u to v. We regard a trivial path, that is, a path composed of one vertex and no edges as an M-balanced path. If P has odd number of edges and $M \cap E(P)$ (resp. $E(P) \setminus M$) is a perfect matching of P, we call it *M-saturated* (resp. *M-exposed*).

Let $H \subseteq G$. We say a path $P \subseteq G$ is an *ear relative to* H if both end vertices of P are in H while internal vertices are not. So do we to a circuit if exactly one vertex of it is in H. For simplicity, we call the vertices of $V(P) \cap V(H)$ *end vertices* of P, even if P is a circuit. For an ear $R \subseteq G$ relative to H, we call it an *M-ear* if $P - V(H)$ is an M-saturated path. Given an M-ear P and $H' \subseteq G$, we call P *through* H' if P has some internal vertices contained in $V(H')$.

We say $X \subseteq V(G)$ is *separating* if any $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ satisfies $V(H) \subseteq X$ or $V(H) \cap X$.

A graph is called *factor-critical* if any deletion of its single vertex leaves a factorizable graph. The next proposition is well-known and might be regarded as a folklore.

Proposition 1. *Let M be a near-perfect matching of a graph G that exposes $v \in V(G)$. Then, G is factor-critical if and only if for any $u \in V(G)$ there exists an M-balanced path from u to v.*

Given a graph G and $X \subseteq V(G)$, we denote the vertices contained in the odd components of $G - X$ as D_X, and $V(G) \setminus X \setminus D_X$ as C_X. The next proposition can be easily observed by the Berge formula, and might be regarded as a folklore.

Proposition 2. *Let G be a graph, and $X \subseteq V(G)$ be its barrier. Then for any maximum matching M of G,*

(i) *each vertex of X is matched to a vertex of D_X,*
(ii) *for each component K of $G[D_X]$, $|\delta(K) \cap M| \leq 1$,*
(iii) *M contains a perfect matching of $G[C_X]$, and*
(iv) *no edge in $E[X, C_X]$ nor $E(G[X])$ are allowed.*

We call a set of vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$ *extreme* if $|V(G-S)| - \nu(G-S) = |V(G)| - \nu(G) + |S|$.

Proposition 3 (see [1]). *For any graph G and $S \subseteq V(G)$,*

(i) *S is extreme if and only if there is a barrier of G containing S. Hence,*
(ii) *any barrier is extreme, and*
(iii) *any subset of an extreme set is extreme.*

Given a graph G, we define $D(G)$ as the set of vertices that can be respectively exposed by a maximum matching, $A(G)$ as $N(D(G))$ and $C(G)$ as $V(G) \setminus (D(G) \cup A(G))$.

Theorem 1 (The Gallai-Edmonds Structure Theorem [1]). *Let G be a graph. Then,*

(i) *$A(G)$ is a barrier of G and $D_{A(G)} = D(G)$,*
(ii) *the components of $G[D(G)]$ are factor-critical, and*
(iii) *all the edges of $E[A(G), D(G)]$ are allowed.*

The *canonical partition* is a decomposition for elementary graphs and plays a crucial role in matching theory. First Kotzig introduced the canonical partition as a quotient set of a certain equivalence relation [5–7], and later Lovász redefined it from the point of view of barriers [1]. In fact, these are equivalent. For an elementary graph G and $u, v \in V(G)$, we say $u \sim v$ if $u = v$ or $G - u - v$ is not factorizable.

Theorem 2 (Kotzig [5–7], Lovász [1]). *Let G be an elementary graph. Then $\sim$ is an equivalence relation on $V(G)$ and the family of equivalence classes is exactly the family of maximal barriers of G.*

The family of equivalence classes of $\sim$ is called the *canonical partition* of G, and denoted by $\mathcal{P}(G)$.

Given a graph G, we call a barrier $X \subseteq V(G)$ of G *odd-maximal* if it is a maximal barrier of $G[X \cup D_X]$. This notion is identical to the one Király calls strong barrier [16], however we call it in the different way so as to avoid the confusion with the notion of strong end by Frank [15]. Note that maximal barriers are odd-maximal and that any odd-maximal barriers are contained in a maximal barrier.

Proposition 4 (Király [16]). *A barrier $X \subseteq V(G)$ of a graph G is odd-maximal if and only if all the odd components of $G - X$ are factor-critical.*

The following is a combination of some properties in [16].

Proposition 5 (see Király [16]). *Let G be a graph.*

(i) *Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq 2^{V(G)}$ be the family of the odd-maximal barriers of G. $\mathcal{X}$ is closed with respect to the operation of taking intersections, and $\bigcap_{X\in\mathcal{X}} X = A(G)$.*
(ii) *$S \subseteq V(G)$ is an odd-maximal barrier of a graph G if and only if it is a disjoint union of $A(G)$ and an odd-maximal barrier of a factorizable subgraph $G[C(G)]$.*
(iii) *For any extreme set $S \subseteq V(G)$, minimal odd-maximal barriers containing S uniquely exist, and it is identical to $A(G - S) \cup S$.*

Remark 1. Note that maximal barriers are odd-maximal and that any odd-maximal barriers are contained in a maximal barrier. As we can see by Proposition 2, in elementary graphs, the notion of maximal barriers and odd-maximal barriers coincide. Thus, in this paper, we work on odd-maximal barriers. Since $A(G)$ is a canonical notion, in order to investigate how odd-maximal or maximal barriers distribute in graphs, it suffices to work on factorizable graphs.

The notion of the elementary components and the induced elementary components coincide if the graph is bipartite (see [1]). Induced elementary components of a bipartite factorizable graph are known to have the following partially ordered structure, which is different from the one in [11, 12]. It is sometimes presented as a theorem for general bipartite graphs, though we introduce it as one for bipartite factorizable graphs.

Theorem 3 (The Dulmage-Mendelsohn Decomposition [1, 17–20]). *Let $G = (A, B; E)$ be a bipartite factorizable graph, and let $\mathcal{G}(G) =: \{G_i\}_{i\in I}$. Let $A_i := A \cap V(G_i)$ and $B_i := B \cap V(G_i)$ for each $i \in I$. Then, there exist an partial order $\preceq_A$ on $\mathcal{G}(G)$ such that for any $i, j \in I$,*

(i) *$E[B_j, A_i] \neq \emptyset$ yields $G_j \preceq_A G_i$, and*
(ii) *if $G_j \preceq_A H \preceq_A G_i$ yields $G_i = H$ or $G_j = H$ for any $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, $E[A_i, B_j] \neq \emptyset$.*

We call this decomposition of G into a poset *the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition* (in short, *the DM-decomposition*), and each element of $\mathcal{G}(G)$ *DM-component*. The DM-decomposition is uniquely determined to a graph, up to the choice of roles of color classes. In this paper, we call the DM-decomposition of $G = (A, B; E)$ as in Theorem 3 *with respect to A*.

Proposition 6 (Dulmage & Mendelsohn [17–20]). *Let* $G = (A, B; E)$ *be a bipartite factorizable graph, and* M *be a perfect matching of* G*. Let* $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}(G)$*, and let* $u \in A \cap V(G_1)$*,* $v \in A \cap V(G_2)$*, and* $w \in B \cap V(G_2)$*. Then there is an* M*-balanced path from* u *to* v *if and only if* $G_1 \preceq_A G_2$*, and an* M*-saturated path between* u *to* w *if and only if* $G_1 \preceq_A G_2$*.*

Hereafter in this section we present some basic properties used throughout this paper.

Proposition 7. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph, and* $X \subseteq V(G)$*. Then, the following three properties are equivalent;*

(i) X *is separating.*
(ii) *There exists* $H_1, \ldots, H_k \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ *such that* $X = V(H_1)\dot{\cup}\cdots\dot{\cup}V(H_k)$*.*
(iii) *For any perfect matching* M *of* G*,* $\delta(X) \cap M = \emptyset$*.*
(iv) *For any perfect matching* M *of* G*,* M_X *forms a perfect matching of* $G[X]$*.*

Proposition 8. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph, and* M *be a perfect matching of* G*. Let* $X \subseteq V(G)$ *be such that* M_X *forms a perfect matching of* $G[X]$*, and* P *be an* M*-alternating path.*

(i) *If* $X \cap V(P)$ *has no vertex exposed by* M_P*, then each connected component of* $P \cap G[X]$ *is an* M*-saturated path.*
(ii) *If both end vertices of* P *are in* X*, then each connected component of* $P - E(G[X])$ *is an* M*-ear relative to* $G[X]$*.*

Proposition 9. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph, and* M *be a perfect matching of* G*. Let* P *and* Q *be* M*-alternating paths. If* P *and* Q *intersects only with their internal vertices, then each connected component of* $P \cap Q$ *is an* M*-saturated path.*

Proposition 10. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph,* M *be a perfect matching of* G*, and* $u, v \in V(G)$*. Then, the following three properties are equivalent;*

(i) $G - u - v$ *is factorizable.*
(ii) *There is an* M*-saturated path of* G *between* u *and* v*.*
(iii) $\{u, v\}$ *is NOT extreme.*

Proposition 11. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph,* M *be a perfect matching of* G*, and* $u, v \in V(G)$*. If there is an* M*-alternating circuit* C *with* $u, v \in V(C)$*, then* u *and* v *are contained in the same induced elementary component of* G*.*

3 Canonical Structures of Factorizable Graphs

In this section, we introduce results in our previous paper [11, 12], which is on canonical structures of general graphs with perfect matchings.

Given a factorizable graph G and $G_1 \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, we call $X \subseteq V(G)$ a *separating set for* G_1 if it is separating set with $V(G_1) \subseteq X$, and $G[X]/G_1$ is factor-critical.

Definition 1. *Let G be a factorizable graph and $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}(G)$. We say $G_1 \lhd G_2$ if there exists a separating set $X \subseteq V(G)$ for G_1 that contains G_2.*

Let G be a factorizable graph and M be a perfect matching of G. We call a sequence of induced elementary components $H_0, \ldots, H_k \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ an *M-ear sequence from H_0 to H_k* if there is an M-ear relative to H_{i-1} and through H_i for each $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$.

Proposition 12 (Kita [11, 12]). *Let G be an elementary graph and M be a perfect matching of G. Then for any two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ there is an M-saturated path between u and v, or an M-balanced path from u to v.*

The next theorem gives an equivalent definition of $\lhd$.

Theorem 4 (Kita [11, 12]). *Let G be a factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}(G)$. Then, $G_1 \lhd G_2$ if and only if there exists an M-ear sequence from G_1 to G_2.*

By the above properties, the following is obtained.

Theorem 5 (Kita [11, 12]). *$\lhd$ is a partial order.*

Corollary 1. *Let G be a factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$. Let P be an M-ear relative to H. Then, for any $H' \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ with $(V(P) \setminus V(H)) \cap V(H') \neq \emptyset$, $H \lhd H'$.*

Now we introduce a generalization of the canonical partition. For non-elementary graphs, the family of maximal barriers never gives a partition of its vertex set [1]. Therefore, to analyze the structures of general graphs with perfect matchings, we generalized the canonical partition based on Kotzig's way [5–7].

Definition 2. *Let G be a factorizable graph. For any $u, v \in V(H)$, we say $u \sim_G v$ if u and v are contained in the same induced elementary component of G and satisfy $u = v$ or $G - u - v$ is not factorizable.*

Theorem 6 (Kita [11, 12]). *For any factorizable graph G, $\sim_G$ is an equivalence relation.*

We call the family of equivalence classes of $\sim_G$ the *generalized canonical partition* and denote as $\mathcal{P}(G)$. Since each equivalence class of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is contained in an induced elementary component, we denote for each $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ the family of equivalence classes of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ in $V(H)$ as $\mathcal{P}_G(H)$. Note also that the generalized canonical partition $\mathcal{P}_G(H)$ is a refinement of $\mathcal{P}(H)$ for each $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$.

Proposition 13. *Let G be a factorizable graph, and M be a perfect matching. Let $u, v \in V(G)$ be vertices contained in the same induced elementary component of G. Then, $u \sim_G v$ if and only if there is no M-saturated path between u and v.*

Proof. Immediate from the definitions and Proposition 10. □

We denote all the upper bounds of $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ in $(\mathcal{G}(G), \triangleleft)$ as $\mathcal{U}^*_G(H)$ and define $\mathcal{U}_G(H)$ as $\mathcal{U}^*_G(H) \setminus \{H\}$, and the vertices contained in $\mathcal{U}^*_G(H)$ (resp. $\mathcal{U}_G(H)$) as $U^*_G(H)$ (resp. $U_G(H)$). We sometimes omit the subscripts if they are apparent from the context.

There are correlations between the partial order and the generalized canonical partition.

Lemma 1 (Kita [11,12]). *Let G be a factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$. Let P be an M-ear relative to H with end vertices $u, v \in V(H)$. Then $u \sim_G v$.*

Proposition 14 (Kita [12]). *Let G be a factorizable graph, and $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$. Then, $G[U^*(H)]/H$ is factor-critical.*

Theorem 7 (Kita [11,12]). *Let H be an induced elementary component of a factorizable graph G. Then, for each connected component K of $G[U(H)]$, there exists $S \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$ such that $N(K) \cap V(H) \subseteq S$.*

By Theorem 7, we can see that upper bounds of an induced elementary component are each “attached” to an equivalence class of the generalized canonical partition.

Since another proof for the cathedral theorem [1] can be easily obtained as an extremal consequence of the above canonical structures, we call these i.e. the poset structure $(\mathcal{G}(G), \triangleleft)$, and the generalized canonical partition $\mathcal{P}(G)$, together with the information that to which element of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ each induced elementary component is attached as an upper bound, the *generalized cathedral structure*, or just the *cathedral structure* of a factorizable graph.

Theorem 8 (Kita [11,12]). *Given a factorizable graph G, the poset $(\mathcal{G}(G), \triangleleft)$ and the generalized canonical partition $\mathcal{P}(G)$ can be computed in $O(nm)$ time.*

4 Barriers in Canonical Structures

Hereafter we show our new results. In this section, we show that the structure of any odd-maximal barrier can be written in words of the generalized cathedral structure; As we see in previous sections, the generalization of the canonical partition is attained by the equivalence relation based on Kotzig's way. Here we show that it can be also seen from Lovász's point of view i.e. that its equivalence classes forms the smallest units of the odd-maximal barriers. Additionally, the structures of their odd components are characterized in terms of the cathedral structure.

4.1 Barriers vs. Alternating Paths

For a graph G and $X \subseteq V(G)$, we denote the bipartite graph resulting from deleting the even components of $G - X$, removing edges in X and contracting each factor-critical component of $G - X$ into one vertex, as $H_G(X)$.

Proposition 15. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph and* X *be an odd-maximal barrier of* G*. If* $M \subseteq E(G)$ *is a perfect matching of* G*, then* $M \cap \delta(X)$ *forms a perfect matching of* $H_G(X)$*. Conversely, if* M' *is a perfect matching of* $H_G(X)$*, there is a perfect matching* M *of* G *such that* $M' = M \cap \delta(X)$*.*

Proof. The first claim follows by Proposition 2. For the latter one, first note that $G[C_X]$ is factorizable by Proposition 2, and let N be a perfect matching of it. Let $K_1, \ldots, K_l$ be the odd components of $G - X$. By proposition 4, the odd components $K_1, \ldots, K_l$ of $G - X$ are each factor-critical. For each $i = 1, \ldots, l$ let M_i be a near-perfect matching of K_i exposing only the vertex matched by M'. Then, $N \cup M' \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} M_i$ forms a desired perfect matching. □

Proposition 16. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph, and* M *be a perfect matching of* G*. If* $X \subseteq V(G)$ *is extreme, then for any* $u, v \in X$ *there is no* M*-saturated path between* u *and* v*.*

Proof. By Proposition 3, $\{u, v\}$ is extreme. Therefore, by Proposition 10, the claim follows. □

Proposition 17. *Let* G *be a fatorizable graph, and* M *be a perfect matching, and* X *be a barrier of* G*. Then, for any* $x \in X$ *and* $y \in C_X$*, there is no* M*-saturated path between* x *and* y *nor* M*-balanced path from* x *to* y*.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise, that is, there is a path P which is M-saturated between x and y or M-balanced from x to y. Trace P from x, and let z be the first vertex we encounter that is in C_X, and let w be the last vertex in $X \cup D_X$ we encounter if we trace xPz from x. Apparently, $w \in X$, $wz \in E(xPz)$, and by Proposition 2 $wz \notin M$. Therefore, xPw is an M-saturated path between x and w, contradicting Proposition 16. □

Proposition 18. *Let* G *be a factorizable graph,* $X \subseteq V(G)$ *be an odd-maximal barrier of* G*, and* $\mathcal{K} := \{K_i\}_{i=1}^{l}$ *be the family of odd components of* $G - X$*, where* $l = |X|$*. Let* M *be a perfect matching of* G*, and* M' *be the perfect matching of* $H_G(X)$ *such that* $M' = M \cap \delta(X)$*. Let* $u, v \in X$*, and* $w \in V(K)$*, where* $K \in \mathcal{K}$*, and let* w_K *be the contracted vertex of* $H_G(X)$ *corresponding to* K*.*

(i) *Then, for any* M*-balanced path (resp.* M*-saturated path)* P *of* G *from* u *to* v *(resp. between* u *and* w*), there is an* M'*-balanced path (resp.* M'*-saturated path)* P' *of* $H_G(X)$ *from* u *to* v *(resp. between* u *and* w_K*) such that* $P' = P/K_1/\cdots/K_l$*.*
(ii) *Conversely, for any* M'*-balanced path (resp.* M'*-saturated path)* P' *from* u *to* v *in* $H_G(X)$ *(resp. between* u *and* w_K*), there is an* M*-balanced path (resp.* M*-saturated path)* P *from* u *to* v *in* G *(resp. between* u *and* w*) such that* $P' = P/K_1/\cdots/K_l$*.*

Proof. For (i), we first prove the case where P is an M-balanced path. Let $u = x_1, \ldots, x_{l'} = v$ be the vertices of $X \cap V(P)$, and suppose, without loss of generality, they appear in this order if we trace P from u. For each $i = 1, \ldots, l'$, let $L_i \in \mathcal{K}$ be such that $x_i' \in V(L_i)$, which is well-defined by Proposition 2, and let z_i be the contracted vertex of $H_G(X)$ corresponding to L_i. Note that by Proposition 2, if $x_i \neq x_j$, then $L_i \neq L_j$, accordingly, $z_i \neq z_j$. We denotes $|E(P)| =: 2k$, and proceed by induction on k.

If $k = 0$, the claim is obviously true. Let $k > 0$ and suppose the claim is true for $0, \ldots, k-1$. By the definitions, the internal vertices of uPx_2 are contained in L_1. By Proposition 2, $\delta(L_i) \cap M = \{uu'\}$. Thus, the last edge of uPx_2 is not in M, and uPx_2 is an M-balanced path, accordingly so is x_2Pv.

Note that $P_1' := uPx_2/K_1/\ldots/K_l$ is an M-balanced path, namely, $uz_1 + z_1x_2$. If $x_2 = v$, therefore, the claim follows. Suppose $x_2 \neq v$. By the induction hypothesis, $P_2' := x_2Pv/K_1/\ldots/K_l$ is an M'-balanced paths of $H_G(X)$, whose vertices are $\{x_2, \ldots, x_{l'} = v\} \cup \{z_2, \ldots, z_{l'-1}\}$. Thus, $V(uPx_2) \cap V(x_2Pv) = \{x_2\}$, accordingly, $P' = P_1' + P_2'$ is an M'-balanced path of $H_G(X)$ from u to v. The other case where P is an M-saturated path can be proved by similar arguments.

For (ii), we first prove the case where P' is an M'-balanced path of $H_G(X)$. Let $u = x_0, y_0, \ldots, x_p, y_p, x_{p+1} = v$ be the vertices of P', and suppose they appear in this order if we trace P' from u. Note that $x_i \in X$ for each $i = 0, \ldots, p+1$, and that y_i be a contracted vertex corresponding to an odd component of $G - X$, say L_i, for each $0, \ldots, p$. For each $i = 0, \ldots, p$, let $x_i y_i^1 \in E(G)$ be such that corresponds to $x_i y_i \in E(P')$ and $y_i^2 x_{i+1} \in E(G)$ to $y_i x_{i+1} \in E(P')$. Note that $y_i^1, y_i^2 \in V(L_i)$. Then, since $x_i y_i \in M'$ and $y_i x_{i+1} \notin M'$, $x_i y_i^1 \in M$ and $y_i^2 x_{i+1} \in M$. Since L_i is factor-critical by Proposition 4, and M_{L_i} forms a near-perfect matching of L_i, which exposes y_i^1, by Proposition 2, there is an M-balanced path Q_i from y_i^2 to y_i^1 which is contained in L_i, by Proposition 1. Thus, replacing each y_i by Q_i on P', we can get an M-balanced path from u to v in G. The other case where P' is an M'-saturated path can be proved by similar arguments. □

Given a factorizable graph G, and an odd-maximal barrier X, we denote as just *the DM-decomposition of* $H_G(X)$ the one with respect to the color class X. In this case we sometimes omit the subscripts and denote as just $\preceq$.

Definition 3. *Let G be a factorizable graph, and X be an odd-maximal barrier of G. Let D be a DM-component of $H_G(X)$, whose vertices in $V(D) \setminus X$ are the contracted vertices resulting from odd components $K_1, \ldots, K_l$ of $G - X$. We say $\tilde{D} \subseteq G$ is the expansion of D if it is the subgraph of G induced by $(V(D) \cap X) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} V(K_i)$.*

Note that by the definition, if $\tilde{D} \subseteq G$ is the expansion of a DM-component D of $H_G(X)$, $H_{\tilde{D}}(X \cap V(\tilde{D}))$ is isomorphic to D.

Proposition 19. *Let G be a factorizable graph, and X be an odd-maximal barrier of G. Let $D_1, \ldots, D_k$ be the DM-components of $H_G(X)$. For each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, let $\tilde{V}_i \subseteq V(G)$ be such that $G[\tilde{V}_i]$ be the expansion of D_i. Then, $\{\tilde{V}_i\}_{i=1}^{l}$ forms a partition of $X \cup D_X$, each member of which is separating.*

Proof. Since the DM-components of $H_G(X)$ form the partition of the vertices of it, the first half of the claim apparently follows from the definitions. For the latter part, suppose that $\tilde{V}_i$ is not separating, equivalently by Proposition 7, that there is a perfect matching M of G such that $\delta(\tilde{V}_i) \cap M \neq \emptyset$. Then, by Proposition 15, the perfect matching $M' := M \cap \delta(X)$ forms a perfect matching of $H_G(X)$ satisfying $\delta(D_i) \cap M' \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Thus, we are done. □

Lemma 2. *Let G be a factorizable graph, X be an odd-maximal barrier, and M be a perfect matching of G. Let $u, v \in X$, and $w \in D_X$, and let, for each $\alpha = u, v, w$, D_α be the DM-component of $H_G(X)$ whose expansion $\tilde{D}_\alpha$ contains α. Then, there is an M-balanced path from u to v (resp. an M-saturated path from u to w) if and only if $D_u \preceq D_v$ (resp. $D_u \preceq D_w$).*

Proof. First note that $\tilde{D}_\alpha$ is well-defined by Proposition 19. Now the claim is immediate from Proposition 6 and Proposition 18. □

Lemma 3. *Let $G = (A, B; E)$ be a bipartite factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and D_1, D_2 be DM-components of G with $D_1 \preceq_A D_2$. Then, for any $u \in V(D_1) \cap A$ and $v \in V(D_2) \cap B$, any M-saturated path P between u and v traverses $A \cap V(D_2)$.*

Proof. Apparently $vv' \in E(P)$ and $v' \in V(D_2) \cap A$, therefore, the claim follows. □

Lemma 4. *Let G be a factorizable graph, X be an odd-maximal barrier, and M be a perfect matching of G. Let $\tilde{D}_1$ and $\tilde{D}_2$ be the subgraph of G which are respectively the expansions of the DM-components D_1 and D_2 such that $D_1 \preceq D_2$. Then, for any $u \in X \cap V(\tilde{D}_1)$ and $w \in V(\tilde{D}_2) \setminus X$, any M-saturated path P between u and w traverses $X \cap V(\tilde{D}_2)$.*

Proof. Let $K_1, \ldots, K_l$, where $l = |X|$, be the odd components of $G - X$. By Proposition 18, $P' := P/K_1/\cdots/K_l$ is an M'-saturated path, where $M' = M \cap \delta(X)$, whose end vertices are respectively in $X \cap V(D_1)$ and $V(D_2) \setminus X$. Therefore, P' traverses $X \cap V(D_2)$ by Lemma 3, which means P traverses $X \cap V(\tilde{D}_2)$. □

4.2 A Canonical Characterization of Odd-maximal Barriers

Based on Theorem 7, for $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ of a factorizabe graph G and $S \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$, we denote the set of induced elementary components contained in a connected component of $\mathcal{U}(H)$, say K, such that $N(K) \cap V(H) \subseteq S$, as $\mathcal{U}_G(S)$, and the vertices contained it as $U_G(S)$. Additionally, we denote $U_G(S) \cup S$ as $U^*_G(S)$. We sometimes omit the subscripts if they are apparent from the contexts.

Proposition 20 (implicitely stated in [11, 14]). *Let G be a factorizable graph, and let $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ and $S \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$. Then, $G[U^*(S)]/S$ is factor-critical.*

Lemma 5. *Let G be a factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and let $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, and $S \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$. Then, for any $x \in U^*(S)$, there is an M-balanced path from x to a vertex $y \in S$, whose vertices except y are contained in $U(S)$.*

Proof. $M_{U(S)}$ forms a near-perfect matching of G' exposing only the contracted vertex s corresponding to S, and By Proposition 20, $G' := G[U^*(S)]/S$ is factor-critical. Therefore, by Proposition 1, there is an $M_{U(S)}$-balanced path from any $x \in U^*(S)$ to s, which corresponds to a desired path in G, and the claim follows. $\square$

Lemma 6. *Let G be a factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and $u, v \in V(G)$ be such that $\{u, v\}$ is an extreme set of G. If there are M-balanced paths respectively from u to v and from v to u, then u and v are in the same induced elementary component of G.*

Proof. Let P be an M-balanced path from u to v, and Q from v to u. Trace Q from v and let x be the first vertex we encounter, except v, that is in P.

Claim 1. uPx is an M-balanced path from u to x, and $C := xQv + vPx$ is an M-alternating circuit containing x and v.

Proof. Suppose the first claim fails, that is, uPx is an M-saturated path between u and x. Then, $uPx+xQv$ is an M-saturated path between u and v, contradicting Proposition 16. Therefore, uPx is an M-balanced path from u to x, accordingly the latter claim follows. $\square$

Claim 2. u and v respectively form components of $P \cap Q$. Therefore, the number of component of $P \cap Q$ is no less than two, and is exactly two if and only if $V(P \cap Q) = \{u, v\}$.

Proof. Note that $\delta(u) \cap (E(P) \cap E(Q)) = \emptyset$, and the same thing also holds for v. Therefore the claims follow. $\square$

We proceed by induction on the number k of the components of $P \cap Q$. If $k = 2$, i.e. $u = x$, then u and v are contained in the M-alternating circuit $C = xQv + vPx$. Thus the claim follows by Proposition 11.

If $k > 2$, i.e. $u \neq x$, let $M' := M \triangle E(C)$. Let $y \in V(P \cap Q)$ be such that xPy is a component of $P \cap Q$. By Proposition 9, xPy is an M-saturated path. Therefore $P' := uPx + xQv$ and $Q' := vPy + yQu$ are M'-balanced paths respectively from u to v and from v to u, such that $P' \cap Q'$ has less number of components than $P \cap Q$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis, the claim follows. $\square$

Lemma 7. *Let G be a factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and let $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ and $S \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$. Then, for any $s \in S$ and $x \in U(S)$, there is no M-saturated path between s and x nor M-balanced path from s to x.*

Proof. Suppose the claim fails, that is, there is a path P that is M-balanced from s to x or M-saturated between s and x. Trace P from s and let y be the first vertex we encounter that is in $U(S)$. Trace sPy from y and let z be the first vertex we encounter that is in H. Then, zPy is an M-exposed path, consequently sPz is an M-saturated path between s and z, which means $z \notin S$ by Proposition 13.

On the other hand, by Lemma 5, there is an M-balanced path Q from y to some vertex $t \in S$ whose vertices except t are contained in $U(S)$. Therefore, $zPy + yQt$ is an M-ear relative to H, whose end vertices are z and t, a contradiction by Lemma 1. □

Lemma 8. *Let G be a factorizable graph and M be a perfect matching of G, and let $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, and $u, v \in V(H)$ be such that $u \not\sim_G v$. Let P be an M-saturated path between u and v such that $E(P) \setminus E(H) \neq \emptyset$, and let $P_1, \ldots, P_l$ be the components of $P - E(H)$. Let $S_0, S_{l+1} \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$ be such that $u \in S_0$, $v \in S_{l+1}$. Then,*

(i) *two end vertices of P_i belong to the same member of $\mathcal{P}_G(H)$, say S_i,*
(ii) *P_i is, except its end vertices, contained in $\mathcal{U}(S_i)$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, l$, and*
(iii) *for any S_i, S_j such that $0 \leq i < j \leq l+1$, $S_i \neq S_j$.*

Proof. By Proposition 8, P_i is an M-ear relative to H for each $i = 1, \ldots, l$, therefore (i) follows by Lemma 1. Thus, by Corollary 1, (ii) follows. For (iii), let the end vertices of P_i be x_i and y_i for each $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the vertices $u =: y_0, x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_l, y_l, x_{l+1} := v$ appear in this order if we trace P from u. Then, for any S_i, S_j with $0 \leq i < j \leq l+1$, $y_i P x_j$ forms an M-saturated path. Thus we have $S_i \neq S_j$ by Proposition 13. □

Lemma 9. *Let G be a factorizable graph, M be a perfect matching of G, and let $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ and $S, T \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$ be such that $S \neq T$. Then, for any $s \in S$ and $t \in U^*(T)$, there is an M-saturated path P between s and t, which is contained in $U^*(H) \setminus U(S)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5, there is an M-balanced path P_1 from t to a vertex $x \in T$ whose vertices except x are contained in $U(T)$. By Proposition 13, there is an M-saturated path P_2 between s and x. By Lemma 8, $V(P_2) \setminus \{x\}$ is contained in $\mathcal{U}^*(H) \setminus \mathcal{U}(S) \setminus \mathcal{U}^*(T)$, accordingly $V(P_1) \cap V(P_2) = \{x\}$. Hence, $P := P_1 + P_2$ is an M-saturated path between s and t, contained in $\mathcal{U}^*(H) \setminus \mathcal{U}(S)$. □

Theorem 9. *Let G be a factorizable graph, X be an odd-maximal barrier of G. Let $\tilde{V}_1, \ldots, \tilde{V}_k$ be the partition of $X \cup D_X$ such that for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$ $\tilde{D}_i := G[\tilde{V}_i]$ is the expansion of a DM-component D_i of $H_G(X)$. Then, for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $S_i := X \cap \tilde{V}_i$ coincides to a member of $\mathcal{P}_G(H_i)$ for some $H_i \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, and the set of vertices in $\mathcal{U}^*(H_i) \setminus \mathcal{U}(S_i)$ coincides to $\tilde{V}_i$.*

Proof. Note that such a partition of $X \cup D_X$ surely exists by Proposition 19. Let M be a perfect matching of G. Let $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. For the first part of the claim, note the following claims;

Claim 3. There is no M-saturated path between any two vertices in S_i.

Proof. Since X is extreme, $S_i \subseteq X$ is extreme by Proposition 3. Hence the claim follows by Proposition 16. □

Claim 4. For any $u, v \in S_i$, there are M-balanced paths respectively from u to v and v to u.

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 2 and Proposition 13. □

By Claims 3 and 4, Lemma 6 derives that S_i is contained in the same induced elementary component of G, say H_i. Moreover, by Claim 3 again and Proposition 13, there exists $S' \in \mathcal{P}_G(H_i)$ such that $S_i \subseteq S'$. Since $\tilde{V}_i$ is separating by Proposition 19,

Claim 5. $V(H_i) \subseteq V(\tilde{D}_i)$.

Claim 6. For any $u \in S_i$ and any $v \in \tilde{V}_i \setminus S_i$, there is an M-saturated path between u and v which is contained in $\tilde{V}_i$.

Proof. Note that S_i is an odd-maximal barrier of $\tilde{D}_i$ and that $H_{\tilde{D}_i}(S_i)$ is a factorizable bipartite graph with exactly one DM-component. Thus, by applying Lemma 2 to $\tilde{D}_i$ and S_i, there is an M-saturated path between any $u \in S_i$ and any $v \in \tilde{V}_i \setminus S_i$, which is contained in $\tilde{D}_i$. □

Thus, by combining Claims 5 and 6, we can conclude $S_i = S'$, and we are done for the first part of the claim.

Claim 7. $\tilde{V}_i \supseteq U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$.

Proof. Take $y \in U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$ arbitrarily, and let $T \in \mathcal{P}_G(H_i) \setminus \{S_i\}$ be such that $y \in U(T)$. Let $u\ inS_i$. There is an M-saturated path P between u and y which is contained in $U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$ by Lemma 9. Hence, by Propositions 16 and 17, $y \in D_X$. Therefore, there exists $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $y \in \tilde{V}_j$. By Lemma 2, $D_i \preceq D_j$. If $i \neq j$, by Lemma 4, P has some internal vertices which belong to S_j. However, by Proposition 16, there is no M-saturated path between any two vertices respectively in S_i and S_j, which means S_j is disjoint from $U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$ by Lemma 9, a contradiction. Hence, we can see that $i = j$, accordingly, $U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$ is contained in $\tilde{V}_i$. □

Claim 8. $\tilde{V}_i \subseteq U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$.

Proof. By the definitions, obviously $V(H_i) \subseteq U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$. Therefore it suffices to prove that $\tilde{V}_i \setminus V(H_i) \subseteq U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$. Let $z \in \tilde{V}_i \setminus V(H_i)$. By Claim 6, there is an M-saturated path P between z and some vertex of S_i which is contained in $\tilde{V}_i$. Trace P from z and let w be the first vertex we encounter that is in $V(H_i)$. Since $V(H_i)$ is separating, zPw is an M-balanced path from z to w by Proposition 7. In $\tilde{D}_i/H_i$, zPw corresponds to an M-balanced path from z to the contracted vertex h, corresponding to H_i. Therefore , $\tilde{D}_i/H_i$ is factor-critical by Proposition 1, accordingly, $\tilde{V}_i$ is contained in $U^*(H_i)$. Additionally, by Claim 6 again and Lemma 7, we can see that $\tilde{V}_i$ is contained in $U^*(H_i) \setminus U(S_i)$. □

Thus, by Claims 7 and 8, the latter half of the claim follows. □

Proposition 21. *Let G be a factorizable graph, and $S \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. Then, $S \cup A(G-S)$ is the minimal odd-maximal barriers containins S.*

Proof. Take $x \in X$ arbitrarily. Since $\{x\}$ is extreme, $X' := \{x\} \cup A(G-x)$ is an odd-maximal barrier by Proposition 5. Therefore, by Theorem 9, $S \subseteq X'$, which means S is extreme by Proposition 3. Therefore, the claim follows by Proposition 5. $\square$

Remark 2. Theorem 9 tells that the generalized canonical partition forms the smallest units of odd-maximal barriers; Namely, if $X \subseteq V(G)$ is an odd-maximal barrier of a factorizable graph G, then it admits a partition $X := S_1 \dot{\cup} \cdots \dot{\cup} S_k$, where $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^{k} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(G)$. For any $S \in \mathcal{P}(G)$, there exists an odd-maximal barrier containing S by Proposition 21. Thus, in comparison with Theorem 2 for elementary graphs, in the case of general factorizable graphs, the partition of $V(G)$ i.e. $\mathcal{P}(G)$ forms the "atoms" of the (odd-) maximal barriers.

Furthermore, Theorem 9 says the odd components of $G-X$ are structured canonically in terms of the atoms of X. We denote $U^*(H) \setminus U^*(S)$, where $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ and $S \in \mathcal{P}_G(H)$, as ${}^{c}U_G(S)$, or sometimes just ${}^{c}U(S)$. The following is easily observed.

Corollary 2. *Let G be a factorizable graph, and $S \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. Then, $G[{}^{c}U(S)]$ is composed of $|S|$ factor-critical components. Additionally, for any odd-maximal barrier X with $S \subseteq X$, each of them is also one of the odd components of $G-X$.*

Proof. By Proposition 21, there is an odd-maximal X barrier with $S \subseteq X$. Therefore, by applying Theorem 9 to X, we obtain the first claim. The latter claim follows immediately by Theorem 9. $\square$

5 A Slightly More Efficient Algorithm to Compute the Cathedral Structure

Hereafter we denote by n and m respectively the number of vertices and edges (resp. arcs) of input graph (resp. digraph). Note that factorizable graphs satisfy $m = \Omega(n)$, accordingly $O(n+m) = O(m)$.

In [11, 12], we show that the partial order $\triangleleft$ and the generalized canonical partition can be computed in $O(nm)$ time if there input a factorizable graph. The algorithm is composed of three stages, each of which is $O(n)$ times iteration of $O(m)$ time procedure of growing alternating trees; It first computes the induced elementary components, then computes $\triangleleft$ and $\mathcal{P}(G)$ respectively.

With the results in this paper, we present another $O(nm)$ time algorithm to compute them. The upper bound of its time complexity is same as the known one, however the induced elementary components, $\triangleleft$, and $\mathcal{P}(G)$ are here computed simultaneously. Thus, it has some possibility of exhibiting a bit more efficiency.

Theorem 10 (Micali & Vazirani [21], Vazirani [22]). *A maximum matching of a graph can be computed in $O(\sqrt{n}m)$ time.*

Theorem 11 (Edmonds [23], Tarjan [24], Gabow & Tarjan [25]). *Let G be a graph with $m = \Omega(n)$ and suppose we are given a perfect matching of G. Then, $D(G)$, $A(G)$, and $C(G)$ can be computed in $O(m)$ time.*

Theorem 12 (Dulmage & Mendelsohn [17–20]). *For any bipartite factorizable graph G, the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition of G can be computed in $O(m)$ time.*

Proposition 22 (folklore, see [20]). *Let D be a digraph, and $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of strongly-connected components of D. For $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ we say $D_1 \to D_2$ if for any $u \in V(D_1)$ and any $v \in V(D_2)$ there is a dipath from u to v. Then, $\to$ is a partial order on $\mathcal{D}$.*

Proposition 23 (folklore, see [2]). *For any digraph D, the strongly connected components of D can be computed in $O(n+m)$ time.*

Below is the new algorithm: Algorithm 1;

```
Require: a factorizable graph $G$
Ensure: the generalized canonical partition $\mathcal{P}(G)$ and the digraph $Aux(G)$ representing $(\mathcal{G}(G), \triangleleft)$
 1: compute a perfect matching $M$ of $G$;
 2: $U := V(G)$; initialize $f : V(G) \to \{0, 1\}$ by 0;
 3: $A := \emptyset$; $\mathcal{P}(G) := \emptyset$;
 4: while $U \neq \emptyset$ do
 5:    choose $u \in U$;
 6:    compute $X := A(G-u) \cup \{u\}$;
 7:    compute the DM-decomposition of $H_G(X)$;
 8:    for all DM-component $D$ of $H_G(X)$ do
 9:       let $S := X \cap V(D)$; choose arbitrary $v \in S$;
10:       if $f(v) = 0$ then
11:          $\mathcal{P}(G) := \mathcal{P}(G) \cup \{S\}$;
12:          let $\tilde{D} \subseteq G$ be the expansion of $D$;
13:          for all $x \in S$ do
14:             for all $y \in V(\tilde{D}) \setminus X$ do
15:                $A := A \cup \{(x, y)\}$;
16:             end for
17:             $U := U \setminus \{x\}$; $f(x) := 1$;
18:          end for
19:       end if
20:    end for
21: end while
22: output $\mathcal{P}(G)$;
23: $Aux(G) := (V(G), A)$; decompose $Aux(G)$ into its strongly-connected components and output it; STOP.
```

Proposition 24. *While Algorithm 1 is running,*

(i) *$X = A(G-u) \cup \{u\}$ of Line 6 is an odd-maximal barrier of G,*
(ii) *S defined at Line 9 coincides to a member of $\mathcal{P}(G)$, and*
(iii) *$V(\tilde{D}) \setminus X$ at Line 14 coincides to ${}^{c}U(S)$.*

Proof. Since $\{u\}$ is extreme in a factorizable graph G, (i) follows by Proposition 3. Therefore, (ii) and (iii) follows by Theorem 9. $\square$

Lemma 10. *Let G be a factorizable graph and $Aux(G) = (V(G), A)$ be the digraph obtained by inputting G to Algorithm 1. Let $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, $u \in V(H_1)$, and $v \in V(H_2)$.*

(i) *If $(u, v) \in A$, $H_1 \triangleleft H_2$.*
(ii) *If there exists a dipath from u to v in $Aux(G)$, $H_1 \triangleleft H_2$.*

Proof. The arc (u, v) is added to A only at Line 15 if $u \in X \cap V(\tilde{D})$ and $v \in V(\tilde{D}) \setminus X$. Thus (i) follows by Proposition 24. Hence (ii) follows by the transitivity of $\triangleleft$. $\square$

Lemma 11. *Let G be a factorizable graph and $Aux(G) = (V(G), A)$ be the digraph obtained by inputting G to Algorithm 1. Let $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ be such that $H_1 \triangleleft H_2$. Then, for any $u \in V(H_1)$ and $v \in V(H_2)$, there is a dipath from u to v in $Aux(G)$.*

Proof. Let $S \in \mathcal{P}_G(H_1)$ be such that $u \in S$. First suppose that $v \in {}^cU(S)$. Then, (u, v) is added to A at Line 15 when $X \cap V(D)$ of Line 13 coincides to S, which surely occurs by Proposition 24. Hence, the claim holds for this case.

Now suppose the other case that $v \in U^*(S)$. Take $T \in \mathcal{P}_G(H_1) \setminus \{S\}$ and $w \in T$ arbitrarily. The arc (u, w) is added to A at Line 15 when S coincides to $X \cap V(D)$ of Line 13, so is the arc (w, v) when T coincides to $X \cap V(D)$. Therefore the dipath $uw + wv$ satisfies the claim for this case, and we are done. $\square$

Theorem 13. *Let G be a factorizable graph and $Aux(G) = (V(G), A)$ be the digraph obtained by inputting G to Algorithm 1. Then, $H \in \mathcal{G}(G)$ if and only if there is a strongly-connected component D of $Aux(G)$ with $V(H) = V(D)$. Additionally, for any $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{G}(G)$, $H_1 \triangleleft H_2$ if and only if $D_1 \to D_2$, where D_i is the strongly-connected component of $Aux(G)$ with $V(H_i) = V(D_i)$, for each $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Combining Lemmas 10 and 11, we immediately obtain the following claim;

Claim 9. $H_1 \triangleleft H_2$ if and only if for any $u \in V(H_1)$ and any $v \in V(H_2)$ there is a dipath from u to v in $Aux(G)$.

Therefore, we are done by Proposition 22. $\square$

Theorem 14. *Given a factorizable graph G, the poset $(\mathcal{G}(G), \triangleleft)$ and the generalized canonical partition $\mathcal{P}(G)$ can be computed in $O(nm)$ time by Algorithm 1.*

Proof. The correctness follows by Proposition 24 and Theorem 13.

Hereafter we prove the complexity. Line 1 costs $O(\sqrt{n}m)$ time by Theorem 10. Line 2 costs $O(n)$ time, and Line 3 costs $O(1)$ time. Lines 4 to 7 cost $O(m)$ time per each iteration of the while-loop in Line 4. As the while-loop in Line 4 is repeated $O(n)$ times, they cost $O(nm)$ time over the whole algorithm.

Each operations in Lines 8 to 10 costs $O(1)$ time per iteration, and they are iterated $O(n^2)$ time over the whole computation, therefore cost $O(n^2)$ time.

Note that $f(v) = 0$ at Line 10 holds true for at most n times. Therefore, Lines 11 and 12 cost $O(n)$ time. The number of repetition of Lines 13 to 19 is bounded by $|A| = O(n^2)$. Therefore, the operations there costs $O(n^2)$ over the algorithm.

$\square$

References

1. Lovász, L., Plummer, M.D.: Matching Theory. Elsevier Science (1986)
2. Schrijver, A.: Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency. Springer-Verlag (2003)
3. Carvalho, M.H., Cheriyan, J.: An $O(VE)$ algorithm for ear decompositions of matching-covered graphs. ACM Transactions on Algorithms **1**(2) (2005) 324–337
4. Lee, J.: A First Course in Combinatorial Optimization. Cambridge University Press (2004)
5. Kotzig, A.: Z teórie konečných grafov s lineárnym faktorom. I (*in slovak*). Mathematica Slovaca **9**(2) (1959) 73–91
6. Kotzig, A.: Z teórie konečných grafov s lineárnym faktorom. II (*in slovak*). Mathematica Slovaca **9**(3) (1959) 136–159
7. Kotzig, A.: Z teórie konečných grafov s lineárnym faktorom. III (*in slovak*). Mathematica Slovaca **10**(4) (1960) 205–215
8. Edomonds, J., Lovász, L., Pulleyblank, W.R.: Brick decompositions and the matching rank of graphs. Combinatorica **2**(3) (1982) 247–274
9. Lovász, L.: Matching structure and the matching lattice. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **43** (1987) 187–222
10. Carvalho, M.H., Lucchesi, C.L., Murty, U.S.R.: The matching lattice. In Reed, B., Sales, C.L., eds.: Recent Advances in Algorithms and Combinatorics. Springer-Verlag (2003)
11. Kita, N.: A partially ordered structure and a generalization of the canonical partition for general graphs with perfect matchings. to appear in The 23rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2012)
12. Kita, N.: A partially ordered structure and a generalization of the canonical partition for general graphs with perfect matchings. CoRR **abs/1205.3816** (2012)
13. Kita, N.: The third proof of Lovász's cathedral theorem. preprint
14. Kita, N.: A generalization of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition for general graphs. preprint
15. Frank, A.: Conservative weightings and ear-decompositions of graphs. Combinatorica **13**(1) (1993) 65–81
16. Király, Z.: The calculus of barriers. Technical Report TR-9801-2, ELTE (1998)
17. Dulmage, A.L., Mendelsohn, N.S.: Coverings of bipartite graphs. Canadian Journal of Mathematics **10** (1958) 517–534
18. Dulmage, A.L., Mendelsohn, N.S.: A structure theory of bipartite graphs of finite exterior dimension. Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Section III **53** (1959) 1–13
19. Dulmage, A.L., Mendelsohn, N.S.: Two algorithms for bipartite graphs. Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics **11**(1) (1963) 183–194

20. Murota, K.: Matrices and matroids for systems analysis. Springer-Verlag (2000)
21. Micali, S., Vazirani, V.V.: An $O(\sqrt{|v|} \cdot |E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. In: Proceedings of the 21st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. (1980) 17–27
22. Vazirani, V.V.: A theory of alternating paths and blossoms for proving correctness of the $O(\sqrt{V}E)$ general graph maximum matching algorithm. Combinatorica **14** (1994) 71–109
23. Edmonds, J.: Paths, trees and flowers. Canadian Journal of Mathematics **17** (1965) 449–467
24. Tarjan, R.E.: Data Structures and Network Algorithms. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (1983)
25. Gabow, H.N., Tarjan, R.E.: A linear-time algorithm for a special case of disjoint set union. Journal of Computer and System Sciences **30** (1985) 209–221